REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claim 3 was objected to because "the printed circuit board" lack antecedent basis. Applicant has changed "the printed circuit board" into "one of the electrical interface".

Claim 11 was objected to because of antecedent problem with "the printed circuit board". Applicant has changed "the printed circuit board" into "the circuit substrate".

Applicant has corrected informalities of claims 3 and 11 and now requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al in view of Byquist.

The Examiner correctly pointed out that Mori failed to disclose the protrusions disposed on the first sidewalls and the slots defined in the second sidewalls. The Examiner provided Byquist as a teaching for reinforcing the socket body via the protrusions and the slots. Then, the Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mori with the slot and protrusion arrangement of Byquist.

Response

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner mischaracterized Mori as well as improperly combined Mori and Byquist.

The Examiner incorrectly characterized the slide block 40 and the closing mechanism 50 of Mori as well as the ledges 454 and load point channel 416b of Byquist.

Referring to Fig. 9 and the description between lines 56-66, column 5, Mori not only fails to disclose that the slide block 40 is connected to the connecting section, but fails to disclose that the closing mechanism 50 can engage with the slide block 40. As a matter of fact, the slide block 40 can reciprocate in a direction parallel to the horizontal surfaces of the upper and lower blocks 10 and 20, while the closing mechanism 40 is used to convert movement of the cover 30 to horizontal sliding action of the slide block 40.

As to the socket of Byquist, please pay special attention to Fig. 4 and the disclosure between paragraph **[0034]** to **[0040]**, ledges 454 are positioned on opposite ledges 414 of the retention frame 410. The load point channel 416a and 416b is designed to accommodate the aligning load points 436a, 436b of levers 430a, 430b. In other words, the load point channel 416b does not mate with the ledges 414 and, therefore, cannot reinforce the socket 450.

The Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mori with Byquist. Applicant submits, however, that such modification is illogical. As discussed above, neither Mori nor Byquist discloses the engagement between the protrusions and the slots. Thus, there is no motivation or implication that the ledges 454 and load point channel 416b of Byquist can be modified with the testing socket of Mori for reinforcing the socket body.

In summary, the socket disclosed in Mori and the ledges 454 and the load point channel 416b disclosed in Byquist deviate away from the core spirit of the present invention. This supports a conclusion of unobviousness of the invention as defined in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the recited references and is in condition for allowance.

As to the rejection of claims 2-8, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-8 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1 and recite all

limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-8 should also be allowed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al in view of Byquist.

Specifically, the Examiner pointed out that Mori disclosed the invention claimed in claim 9 except for the protrusions of the first sidewalls and the slots of the second sidewalls. The Examiner provided Byquist as a teaching for reinforcing the socket body via the protrusions and the slots. Then, the Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mori with Byquist to reinforce the socket body.

Response

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner mischaracterized Mori and improperly combined Mori and Byquist.

The Examiner incorrectly characterized the slide block 40 and the closing mechanism 50 of Mori as well as the ledges 454 and load point channel 416b of Byquist.

Referring to Fig. 9 and the recitation between lines 56-66, column 5 of Mori, the slide block 40 does not connect with the connecting section of the socket body. In fact, the slide block 40 can reciprocate in a direction parallel to the horizontal surfaces of the upper and lower blocks 10 and 20. On the other hand, Mori fails to disclose that the closing mechanism 50 can engage with the slide block 40. Actually, the closing mechanism 40 is used to convert movement of the cover 30 to horizontal sliding action of the slide block 40.

Referring to Fig. 4 and the disclosure from paragraph **[0034]** to paragraph **[0040]** of Byquist, ledges 454 are positioned on opposite ledges 414 of the retention frame 410. The load point channel 416a and

416b is configured to accommodate the aligning load points 436a, 436b of levers 430a, 430b. That is, the load point channel 416b does not mate with the ledges 454.

The Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mori with Byquist. Applicant submits, however, that such modification is illogical because both Mori and Byquist fail to disclose the mating of the protrusions and the slots. Thus, there is no teach or suggest that the ledge 454 and the load point channel 416b of Byquist can be modified with the socket of Mori.

In summary, the socket disclosed in Mori and the ledges and the load point channels disclosed in Byquist teach away from the core and spirit of this invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is patentable over the recited references and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 10-16 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 9 and incorporate all limitations recited in claim 9 and should, therefore, also be allowed.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, Applicant asserts that all the pending claims are now in proper form and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant earnestly solicits the allowance of all the pending claims at an earlier date.

Respectfully submitted,
Ching-Kuo Chin

By _____
WEI TE CHUNG

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel No.: (408) 919-6137